

### Remarks

Claims 1-24 are pending. The drawings were objected to because they included a following reference character not mentioned in the description, specifically, "21" in Fig. 2. Applicant has amended the description on page 4 to include the reference number 21 in the appropriate section of the description of the embodiments. It is submitted that this amendment to the specification overcomes the Examiner's objection to the drawings and withdrawal of that objection is requested.

Claims 3 and 4 were objected to for informalities. These claims have been amended above and it submitted that the amendments have overcome the objections and withdrawal of these objections is requested.

Claims 13, 19, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13 was rejected because of a lack of units defining the quantity 3. This claim has been amended to clarify that the distance 3 is 3 pixels. This is supported in the specification and does not constitute new matter. It is therefore submitted that this amendment overcomes this rejection and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected due to the lack of definition of the dimension  $2F+1$ . These claims have been canceled. It must be noted that the filter size is not self-contradictory, as the specification specifically states on page 5, lines 20-27 that the filters applied may be two, 1D filters, instead of one, 2D filter. The dimensions set out in claims 19 and 20 were with regard to the two, 1D filters.

Claim 24 has been amended to more clearly show that the article is an article of computer-readable media and that the instructions when executed cause the machine to perform the processes set out in the claim. It is submitted that this amendment overcomes the rejection and withdrawal of the amendment is requested.

Claims 1, 6, 9, 2, 19-20 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoepflin (US Patent No. 6,574,353) in view of Ranganath (US Patent No. 5,239,591). Claims 7, 8 and 10 were objected to but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In the alternative, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 7. Claims 8 and 10 that previously depended from claim 7 have been amended to depend from claim 1. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is now in allowable form and allowance of that claim is requested.

Claims 21 and 24 have been amended in a similar fashion as claim 1. It is submitted that claims 21 and 24 are in allowable form for the reasons as applied to claim 1, and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2-18 depend from claim 1, and claims 22-23 depend from claim 21. These claims inherently contain all of the limitations of the base claim. As indicated in the office action, the prior art does not teach all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further limitations of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 2-18 and 22-23 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

*Julie L. Reed*

---

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

**Customer No. 46404**  
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
1030 SW Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205  
(503) 222-3613